DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 712 CE 007 276

AUTHOR	Stacy, William J.; And Others
TITLE	Determination of Officer Grade Requirements by Management Engineering Teams. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Air Force Human Resources Lab., Lackland AFB, Tex. Occupational and Manpower Research Div.
SPONS AGENCY	Air Force Human Resources Lab., Brooks AFB, Texas.
REPORT NO	AFHRL-TR-75-80
PUB DATE	Dec 75
NOTE	39p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Employment Qualifications; *Evaluation Methods; Job Analysis; Multiple Regression Analysis; *Officer Personnel; *Personnel Evaluation; *Promotion (Occupational); Rating Scales

ABSTRACT

Management Engineering Teams (MET) were used in the development and testing of a methodology for determining non-aircrew officer grade requirements. The methodology tested was an extension of the Officer Grade Requirements (OGR) procedure developed during the 1963-1966 time period. In the OGR project, a criterion board rated 3,575 officer jobs for grade, then a nine-variable multiple regression equation was developed which efficiently predicted the criterion ratings. In the current application, the METs rated 485 officer jobs from the OGR job sample and 1,687 new jobs. For the 485 job samples, predicted composite scores were obtained from MET ratings utilizing the nine-variable regression equation. These scores were correlated with the criterion board ratings on the same jobs, producing a validity coefficient of .90. An interrater reliability of .95 on the total 2,172 jobs was obtained for these raters. These results indicate that METs can reliably rate officer jobs for determination of grade and can accurately replicate the criterion board ratings. Recommendations were made for operational implementation and for further research to provide a more stable grade conversion table and to determine the total distribution of non-aircrew officer grade requirements. Research instruments are appended. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

AFHRL-TR-75-80

JUN 15 1976

AIR FORCE HUMAN RESOURCES LABORATORY

ED124712

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

DETERMINATION OF OFFICER GRADE REQUIREMENTS BY MANAGEMENT ENGINEERING TEAMS

By

William J. Stacy
Gary N. Matthews
Joe T. Hazel

OCCUPATIONAL AND MANPOWER RESEARCH DIVISION
Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236

December 1975
Final Report for Period 1 August 1974 – 31 December 1975

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

AIR FORCE SYSTEMS COMMAND
BROOKS AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS 78235

NOTICE

When US Government drawings, specifications, or other data are used for any purpose other than a definitely related Government procurement operation, the Government thereby incurs no responsibility nor any obligation whatsoever, and the fact that the Government may have formulated, furnished, or in any way supplied the said drawings, specifications, or other data is not to be regarded by implication or otherwise, as in any manner licensing the holder or any other person or corporation, or conveying any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may in any way be related thereto.

This final report was submitted by Occupational and Manpower Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236, under project 7734, with Hq Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC), Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235.

This report has been reviewed and cleared for open publication and/or public release by the appropriate Office of Information (OI) in accordance with AFR 190-17 and DoDD 5230.9. There is no objection to unlimited distribution of this report to the public at large, or by DDC to the National Technical Information Service (NTIS).

This technical report has been reviewed and is approved.

RAYMOND E. CHRISTAL, Technical Director
Occupational and Manpower Research Division

Approved for publication.

HAROLD E. FISCHER, Colonel, USAF
Commander

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER AFHRL-TR-75-80	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) DETERMINATION OF OFFICER GRADE REQUIREMENTS BY MANAGEMENT ENGINEERING TEAMS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final 1 August 1974 – 31 December 1975
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) William J. Stacy Gary N. Matthews Joe T. Hazel		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Occupational and Manpower Research Division Air Force Human Resources Laboratory Lackland Air Force Base, Texas 78236		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 62703F 77340207
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Hq Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFSC) Brooks Air Force Base, Texas 78235		12. REPORT DATE December 1975
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 38
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) management engineering teams job evaluation officer grade requirements policy board criterion development job descriptions policy simulation job requirement factors multiple regression analysis rating scales grade conversion interrater reliability		

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Management engineering teams (MET) were used in the development and testing of a methodology for determining non-aircrew officer grade requirements. The methodology tested was an extension of the Officer Grade Requirements (OGR) procedure developed during the 1963–1966 time period. In the OGR project, a criterion board rated 3,575 officer jobs for grade, then a nine-variable multiple regression equation was developed which efficiently predicted the criterion ratings.

In the current application, the METs rated 485 officer jobs from the OGR job sample and 1,687 new jobs. For the 485 job sample, predicted composite scores were obtained from MET ratings utilizing the nine-variable regression

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

Item 20 (Continued)

equation. These scores were correlated with the criterion board ratings on the same jobs, producing a validity coefficient of .90. An interrater reliability of .95 on the total 2,172 jobs was obtained for these raters. These results indicate that METs can reliably rate officer jobs for determination of grade and can accurately replicate the criterion board ratings.

Recommendations were made for operational implementation and for further research to provide a more stable grade conversion table and to determine the total distribution of non-aircrew officer grade requirements.

PREFACE

This research was completed under Project 7734, Development of Methods for Describing, Evaluating, and Structuring Air Force Occupations; Work Unit 77340207, Development of Methods for Evaluation of Appropriate Grades for Officer Positions. The work unit was established in response to a Request for Personnel Research (RPR 74-20) submitted by Hq USAF/PRMRE and DPXX titled "Development and testing of an Officer Grade Evaluation technology." The RPR requested the development and testing of a method by which management engineering teams (MET) could determine the appropriate grade requirements for individual officer positions based on job content and responsibilities. The methodology tested represents a modification and extension of the Officer Grade Requirements (OGR) technology developed during the 1963–1966 time period. Interim results of the present MET 1974 study were reported by Christal (1975) and a procedural guide, to implement the method, was prepared by Hazel and Carpenter (1975).

In accomplishing the requirements of RPR 74-20, credit and appreciation is expressed to the following individuals:

HQ USAF – Maj Joseph S. Kittle, RPR Requirements Manager, AF/PRMRE

AFHRL – Dr. Raymond E. Christal, Technical Director, Occupational and Manpower Research Division
Colonel James B. Carpenter, Chief, Occupational and Manpower Research Division (November 1974 – June 1975)
Mrs. M. Joyce Giorgia, Scientific Assistant
Mr. Kenneth G. Koym, Task Scientist
Sgt Johnny J. Weissmuller, Computer Specialist
A1C Patrick A. Zumbro, Scientific Assistant
Mrs. Maria M. Courtney, Typist

This study does not constitute authority to alter existing Air Force officer grades. Further action towards such objectives is a function of HQ USAF/PRMRE and is recommended only after certain prescribed additional research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	5
II.	Officer Grade Requirement Research 1963–1966	5
III.	The MET 1974 Study	6
	Benchmark Scale Job Titles	6
	Job Samples	6
	MET Raters	6
IV.	MET 1974 Results	7
	Job Descriptions Completed	7
	MET Rater Characteristics	7
	Reliabilities of Job Sets	7
	Rater Group Reliabilities	8
	Reliability of METs	9
	Validities of the Equation Variables	9
	Grade Conversion Table	9
V.	Summary and Conclusions	10
VI.	Recommendations	11
References		12
Appendix A:	Benchmark Factor Scales	13
Appendix B:	Project Officer Instructions	24
Appendix C:	Air Force Officer Job Survey	25
Appendix D:	MET Rater Instructions	30
Appendix E:	Grade Code Scale	31
Appendix F:	MET Rating Form	33
Appendix G:	UMD/UDL Authorized Grades on Jobs Collected in Each Job Sample	36

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Interrater Reliabilities (R_{kk}) Factors, Grade Ratings, and Composite Scores	8
2	Interrater Reliabilities of Composite Scores by Rater Type for Jobs with Two or More Raters	8
3	Validities of Variables Included in the MET-Applied Grade Evaluation Equation	9
4	Grade Conversion Table	10

DETERMINATION OF OFFICER GRADE REQUIREMENTS BY MANAGEMENT ENGINEERING TEAMS

I. INTRODUCTION

This report describes the application of a methodology by which management engineering teams (MET) can apply job evaluation factors to determine appropriate grade requirements for officer positions. The method represents a modification and extension of the Officer Grade Requirements (OGR) technology developed during the 1963–1966 time period. The OGR study identified a set of job evaluation factors and weights which were demonstrated to be appropriate for evaluating grade requirements based on job content and responsibilities (Christal, 1965). After a review of the major features of the OGR project and certain follow-on research, the application of the grade evaluation technology by METs is discussed.

II. OFFICER GRADE REQUIREMENT RESEARCH 1963–1966

The OGR 1963–1966 studies took place in three phases:

Phase 1. Job sampling and Policy Board Ratings (Hazel, 1965; Hoggatt & Christal, 1966): Approximately 80,000 job descriptions were completed by officers in the field. From the 80,000 job set, a representative sample of 3,575 job descriptions was selected as a criterion sample. A USAF Policy Board, consisting of 22 colonels with considerable Air Force experience, independently evaluated and assigned grades for each description. Exceptionally high interrater agreement ($r = .92$) was found between Policy Board members in their ratings of grades for jobs. On an additional confidence-in-rating scale, Board members expressed high confidence in their own ratings. Biases did not appear toward jobs in any command or specialty. Board members tended to agree on the specific jobs they felt were misgraded, and agreed on the direction and magnitude of the grade changes needed. The conclusion of the analyses was that each job was critically evaluated on its own merit according to its content and responsibility level.

Phase 2. Development of the Policy Equation (Hazel, Christal & Hoggatt, 1966): Job evaluation factors used by the Policy Board members in assigning grades were identified and incorporated into a Policy Equation. The factors identified were: (a) special training and work experience, (b) communication skills, (c) judgment and decision making, (d) planning, and (e) management. The other four variables included in the Policy Equation were: (f) mean grade rating from raters, (g) organizational level of the job, (h) level of the job within the organization, and (i) supervisor's judgment of grade. Ratings on each of these factors and variables were averaged, weighted, and summed to produce composite scores, which in turn were converted into grade ratings.

In addition to the first five job evaluation factors, five other factors were rated but did not enter the policy grade equation. These factors were: formal education; working conditions; originality, ingenuity, and creativeness; interpersonal skills; and risk.

Phase 3. Application of the Policy Equation (Christal, 1965): As a part of validating the Policy Equation, Policy Board ratings from a subset of 1,750 criterion jobs were compared to the grades assigned the same jobs by the Policy Equation from raters in the field. These two sets of grade scores correlated .93 and had approximately equal means and standard deviations. It was concluded that the Policy Equation had shown high stability across time and judges.

From approximately 11,000 officer job descriptions which had been collected and rated, it was possible to make projections as to how the grade structure of the Air Force might change if the Policy Equation was universally applied to determine appropriate grades for jobs. Results of the projections indicated that changes in grade allocations would have to be made in many officer utilization fields to bring statements of grade requirements into line with job demands. In some utilization fields, grade requirements appeared to be grossly overstated; in others they were understated. In every utilization field some jobs were overgraded while others were undergraded. Overall, the OGR project indicated that in 1964 the Air Force was somewhat undergraded at the colonel and lieutenant colonel levels and considerably undergraded at the major level.

Development of Benchmark Scales. (Brokaw & Giorgia, 1966): Critical to deriving an appropriate grade for individual officer positions was the development of reliable measuring instruments for each of the

job factors in the Policy Equation. In 1966, benchmark scales were developed for each factor using job titles. For each level, job titles with high interrater agreement and low standard deviations in ratings were chosen. These scales were validated against 1,000 officer positions taken from the 3,575 criterion sample, and a simplified integer-weight grade equation was developed for operational application to officer positions. The job grades provided by this equation duplicated those of the original Policy Board ($r = .90$).

The research methodology and instruments which have so far been reviewed formed the structure upon which the MET 1974 research was based.

III. THE MET 1974 STUDY

The development of the MET 1974 study involved the following phases: (a) the 1966 benchmark scale job titles were reviewed for currency and substitutes were selected when necessary, (b) a sample of job descriptions rated in 1964 by the OGR Policy Board was selected to determine if MET raters could produce similar grade ratings, (c) a sample of current (1974) officer job descriptions was selected to test the reliability of MET raters, and (d) a package of materials and instructions was prepared for MET personnel to collect and rate the officer job descriptions.

Benchmark Scale Job Titles

Approximately 25 experienced officers, with varied backgrounds, checked the accuracy and currency of the 1966 benchmark scale job titles to be used in the present study. In the event a particular job title was considered out of date it was replaced with a current title. From this evaluation process a nominal number of substitutions were selected. The ten job evaluation factors and revised benchmark scale job titles are given in Appendix A.

Job Samples

A main objective of the present study was to determine if MET raters could produce grade ratings having a high correlation with 1964 OGR Policy Board grade ratings. In order to compare grade ratings between MET raters and the OGR Policy Board, a common set of job descriptions rated by both groups was required. For this purpose, the 1,000 job descriptions in the Brokaw and Giorgia (1966) Benchmark scale study were checked for currency, and a sample of 485 non-aircrew job descriptions was selected for the present study. To test the reliability of raters between MET organizations, two copies of the 485 job descriptions were produced and divided so that each description would be rated by at least two different MET organizations. A further check on reliability between METs was accomplished by using ten of the same 485 job descriptions to be rated by five different MET organizations.

A second sample of approximately 1,800 current officer positions was selected to test the reliability of MET raters. A primary requisite of the second sample was that it be representative of the current non-aircrew population. To achieve a representative sample, the 1974 Unit Detail Listing (UDL) was used to determine the population values authorized in each non-aircrew DAFSC and grade position. The proportion of sample size (N=1,800) to population (N=66,443) was obtained and multiplied against each AFSC and grade position in the non-aircrew population to derive the proportional representative sample. In addition a minimum of one job in each DAFSC and grade position in the non-aircrew population was included in the sample. The 1,800 officer positions were then divided equally among the 91 MET organizations with approximately 20 officer job descriptions of different DAFSCs and grades to be collected by each MET.

MET Raters

During September 1974, HQ USAF, Director of Manpower and Organization, notified by letter all major air commands of the officer grade study and requested the participation of 91 METs. Officer job descriptions were collected by METs in October 1974. For this phase of the project, the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory (AFHRL) forwarded a package of materials and instructions to the MET commander at each of the 91 locations. The commander in turn appointed a project officer to comply with written instructions (Appendix B) to complete the project. Each project officer was provided a by-name roster of the officers to be surveyed at their MET location. The roster also provided alternate names with similar

career fields and grades in the event the original designated officer was not available. METs then contacted each officer in the sample, or his substitute, and insured that the job description survey form (Appendix C) was completed and returned to the MET.

Officer job description ratings by METs were completed during November 1974. Raters selected for the project included officer, civilian, and enlisted MET personnel. Administrative and clerical personnel were not used as raters. Each MET rater was to independently rate approximately 31 officer job descriptions. Eleven of these descriptions were selected from the 485 jobs in the OGR study, and the remaining twenty were a part of the 1,800 descriptions collected from MET locations. Project Officers were instructed to fold back each job description so that only the job information on pages 2 and 3 could be read. Project officers then randomly integrated the recently collected job descriptions (approximately 20) with the eleven OGR job descriptions and placed them in a folder. The job descriptions were randomly sorted to control for rating context effects described by Madden (1960).

The job descriptions were then rated by project officers and MET raters, according to the directions on the rater instruction sheet (Appendix D). Each MET rater was instructed to use the 10 benchmark job evaluation factors and a grade code scale to rate each officer job description. The 16-point grade code scale was designed to permit discrimination of experience within grade levels and is shown in Appendix E. The MET ratings were recorded on a rating form (Appendix F), which had been developed to record rater responses and personal background information about each rater.

IV. MET 1974 RESULTS

Job Descriptions Completed

From the 1,800 officer positions sent to the METs, 1,687 job descriptions were collected. The 1,687 job descriptions, combined with the 485 descriptions from the 1966 OGR study, totaled 2,172 job descriptions and are listed by DAFSC and UMD/UDL grade in Appendix G[1].

MET Rater Characteristics

Valid data was received on the 2,172 jobs from 665 raters across 89 of the 91 participating METs. Of these raters there were 369 enlisted personnel, 166 officers, and 130 civilians. The number of raters at each MET ranged from 2 to 12 with a median of 7 raters per MET.

Ratings on the variables in the Policy Equation were averaged, weighted, and summed to produce composite scores. Regression analysis, using the composite scores for each job as a criterion and background variables of the raters on each job as predictors showed the job scores to be unrelated to rater characteristics, with a maximum R^2 of .0257[2]. These results imply that there were no indications of biased ratings in relation to the background variables examined and that MET raters may be selected independently of the background characteristics.

Generally, from examining background data from the MET rating form, it appeared that METs were well qualified raters. Approximately 65% of the MET raters had completed the work methods and standards training course. The majority of Air Force career experience for 55% of the MET raters was in management engineering, manpower, or both. The average MET rater experience in management engineering was 77 months, and 32 months was the average experience at the currently assigned MET.

Reliabilities of Job Sets

The three job sets in the 1974 study consisted of 485 old jobs (from the 1964 OGR study), 1,687 new jobs (collected by METs) and a set made up of these two sets combined, totaling 2,172 jobs. Interrater

---

[1] In 1964, authorized grades were recorded on Unit Manning Documents (UMD). In 1974, grade authorizations were posted on Unit Detail Listings (UDL).

[2] The full model of the regression analysis included the following 33 background predictor variables:

Three dichotomous rater type variables (enlisted, officer, civilian);
Total months in present MET (continuous);
TAFMS (continuous);
Total months Management Engineering/Manpower experience (continuous);
22 Major Command variables (dichotomous);
ME or AMETA training course completed (dichotomous);
Four dichotomous career experience variables.

reliabilities based on the ten job evaluation factors, grade ratings and composite scores for the three job sets are listed in Table 1. The interrater reliabilities were computed with adjustment for sample size (by the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula) as described by Lindquist (1953, p. 361). Since reliabilities on composite scores of .94 or greater were obtained for each job set it appears more than adequate to infer that MET raters reliably rated both old and new job descriptions.

Table 1. **Interrater Reliabilities (R_{kk}) Factors, Grade Ratings, and Composite Scores[a]**

Factor	Reliabilities Job Set		
	475	1,697	Total 2,172
1 Formal Education	.88	.88	.88
2 Special Training and Work Experience	.84	.85	.85
3 Working Conditions	.80	.81	.81
4 Originality, Ingenuity, and Creativeness	.86	.84	.85
5 Communication Skills*	.87	.84	.85
6 Interpersonal Skills	.83	.82	.83
7 Judgment and Decision Making*	.85	.84	.84
8 Planning*	.85	.86	.86
9 Management*	.84	.87	.86
10 Risk	.81	.86	.85
Grade*	.90	.93	.92
Composite Scores	.94	.95	.95

*Used in Grade Equation.

[a]R_{kk} for seven raters.

Rater Group Reliabilities

Different rater groups, consisting of enlisted, officer and civilian personnel, were identified from the total sample. Interrater reliabilities for jobs with two or more raters of each rater group were computed. These reliabilities were transformed by the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula to reliabilities based on an average of seven raters per job, and are reported in Table 2. Reliabilities on composite scores of .94 or greater were obtained for each rater type. These reliabilities are adequate to state that regardless of rater type, MET raters can reliably rate job descriptions.

Table 2. **Interrater Reliabilities of Composite Scores by Rater Type for Jobs with Two or More Raters[a]**

Rater Type	Reliability[b]	Number of Jobs Rated
Enlisted	.94	1,943
Officer	.96	1,494
Civilian	.95	698
Combined Rater Types	.95	2,172

[a]Computed by the Spearman-Brown Prophecy formula for an average of seven raters per job.

Reliability of METs

The interrater reliabilities on the composite scores for each of the 89 METs participating in the study were also examined. Using an average of seven raters per job, 82 METs obtained an interrater reliability of .91 or higher and the reliabilities of the remaining 7 METs were above .85. These findings indicate that individual METs provide high interrater reliabilities.

Four hundred and fifty jobs of the 485 job set were rated by two (or more) METs. A zero-order correlation was computed between composite scores on each job (two sets of average composite scores being used when more than two METs rated a job), producing a correlation of .91. In addition, ten jobs were selected to be rated by five different METs. Using average composite scores for each job within each MET, an inter-MET reliability of .98 was obtained. Analysis of variance of average composite scores of the ten jobs rated by the five METs were computed across the five METs and a non-significant difference was obtained ($F = .1816$; $df = 4,45$). These analyses support the claim that given the same sets of jobs, METs consistently assign the same grade ratings.

Validities of the Equation Variables

Table 3 presents validity coefficients for each of the nine equation variables and grade evaluation composite scores correlated with the criterion board grade ratings. A high correlation was found between the MET grade evaluation composite scores and criterion board grade ratings ($r = .90$). This high correlation demonstrates that METs applying the grade evaluation procedure assigned with high correspondence the same grade level to each position as did the 1964 Policy Board.

Table 3. **Validities of Variables Included in the MET-Applied Grade Evaluation Equation**

Variables	Validities
Factor 2 Special Training and Work Experience	.61
Factor 5 Communication Skills	.72
Factor 7 Judgment and Decision Making	.73
Factor 8 Planning	.78
Factor 9 Management	.82
Level of Organization	.48
Level of Job Within Organization	.49
Supv Judgment of Grade for Job	.79
Mean MET Judges Grade Ratings	.86
Final Grade Evaluation Composite	.90

Grade Conversion Table

A grade conversion table, providing conversion of composite scores to a seven-point grade scale and a sixteen-point experience level scale, was constructed (Table 4). In addition to providing grade and experience level scores, the conversion table serves the purpose of correcting for the statistical restriction in range on the composite scores encountered when applying a weighted equation (Christal, 1975). The conversion table was based on the 485 OGR job sample. Caution should be exercised in its use until a more stable conversion table is developed on a larger criterion job sample.

Table 4. Grade Conversion Table[a]

Weighted Composite Cumulative Score	Converts to Experience Level	Converts to Grade
300.1 and above[b]	16 to be determined	7 to be determined
289.1 to 300.0	15 Senior Colonel	
261.1 to 289.0	14 Middle Colonel	6 Colonel
238.8 to 261.0	13 Junior Colonel	
217.3 to 238.7	12 Senior Lt Col	
200.9 to 217.2	11 Middle Lt Col	5 Lt Colonel
183.5 to 200.8	10 Junior Lt Col	
162.5 to 183.4	9 Senior Major	
143.9 to 162.4	8 Middle Major	4 Major
122.1 to 143.8	7 Junior Major	
105.3 to 122.0	6 Senior Captain	
80.3 to 105.2	5 Middle Captain	3 Captain
65.5 to 80.2	4 Junior Captain	
64.4 and below[c]	2 Lieutenant	2 Lieutenant

[a]This table is based on data from a 485-job sample and should be treated cautiously in operational use until additional research is completed to produce a more stable conversation table based on a larger job sample.

[b]Although supervisory and MET grade ratings at the general level are allowable, the conversion table does not recognize grade requirements above colonel.

[c]At the present time, the system is not designed to distinguish levels of lieutenant positions.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Officer Grade Evaluation study was conducted at the request of HQ USAF Director of Manpower and Organization. The purpose of the study was to test a technology by which management engineering teams (MET) could apply job evaluation factors to determine appropriate grade requirements for officer positions based upon job content and responsibilities. The technology was applied to all officer positions, excluding those filled by line pilots, navigators, physicians, dentists, and personnel not subject to the constraints of the Officer Grade Limitations Act.

The grade evaluation technology had been initially developed in the time period of 1963–1966. At this time a grade equation system assigned the same grade levels to officer positions as did a Policy Board of highly experienced colonels (validity = .92). The grade equation weighted together the following job evaluation factors: special training and work experience, communication skills, judgment and decision making, planning, management, organization level, level within organization, supervisor's judgment of grade, and field judge grade ratings.

In 1966, a set of benchmark scales was developed to replace the original relative scale used to rate the job evaluation factors. The benchmark scales provided a control for context effects in applying the factors to individual officer positions on a one-at-a-time basis. In 1971–1972 limited studies were accomplished to update the benchmark scales and to produce a refined grade conversion table to interpret composite scores into grade requirements.

The present report has been concerned with the application of the officer grade evaluation technology by METs to accurately determine officer grade requirements. Data was returned from 89 CONUS MET organizations. These METs provided a total of 665 rating evaluations on two job samples. A 485 job sample was used to test whether MET grades allocated to those jobs would be the same as the grades allocated by the 1964 OGR Policy Board. A second sample of 1,687 current officer positions was used to further test the reliability of MET raters on current job descriptions.

Based upon present findings, METs using the grade evaluation technology assigned essentially the same grade levels to 485 officer positions as did the 1964 Policy Board of highly experienced colonels (validity = .90). It appears that MET raters can effectively replicate the work of the original Policy Board in determining officer grade requirements.

Interrater reliabilities within and between METs were also tested. In all cases, the reliabilities obtained indicated that personnel within METs are highly reliable raters. In addition, regression analysis of rater background information showed these variables to have little or no influence on rater behavior. A sixteen-point grade conversion table based upon the sample of 485 job descriptions was constructed in order to convert predicted grade composite scores into grade requirements. Using the conversion table, the 485 job sample was adequate for comparing grades. The current (1974) job sample of 1,687 job descriptions was also sufficient for testing the reliabilities of MET raters. However, Christal (1975) cautions that a sample of 485 jobs is considered too small to construct a stable conversion table and 1,687 job positions are not sufficient for grade requirement projections to the total non-aircrew population. Larger sample sizes are needed to satisfy both of these requirements.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

The grade evaluation technology tested demonstrated that METs can successfully determine grade requirements based upon job content and responsibilities. The technology is supported by years of research and is one of the most defensible systems developed. Based upon the findings of this report it is recommended that MET application of the officer grade evaluation technology be adopted. As a result of the MET 1974 study, a procedural guide for applying the grade evaluation technology has been published by Hazel and Carpenter (1975).

Before the grade evaluation technology becomes operational, it is recommended that a more stable conversion table based upon a larger sample be constructed. Minimum effort would be required to collect MET ratings on an additional 500 to 1,000 positions from the original 1964 criterion board sample for constructing a stable grade conversion table.

If Air Force managers desire to know the grade requirements for the entire non-aircrew population, the MET ratings on an additional 10,000 to 12,000 officer job positions would be sufficient for this purpose. The grade projection technique developed by AFHRL could then be applied to this data to determine the grade requirements for each non-aircrew utilization field.

REFERENCES

Brokaw, L.D., & Giorgia, M.J. *Development of benchmark scales for Air Force officer position evaluation.* PRL-TR-66-9, AD-645 055. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Research Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Division, September 1966.

Christal, R.E. *Officer grade requirements project: I. Overview.* PRL-TR-65-15, AD-622 806. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Research Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Division, September 1965.

Christal, R.E. *Systematic method for establishing officer grade requirements based upon job demands.* AFHRL-TR-75-36, AD-A015 756. Lackland AFB, TX: Occupational and Manpower Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, July 1975.

Hazel, J.T. *Officer grade requirements project: II. Job descriptions, sample selection, and criterion board.* PRL-TR-65-18, AD-629 575. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Research Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Division, November 1965.

Hazel, J.T., & Carpenter, J.B. *Procedure for determining grades of officer positions.* AFHRL-TR-75-31, AD-A015 755. Lackland AFB, TX: Occupational and Manpower Research Division, Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, July 1975.

Hazel, J.T., Christal, R.E., & Hoggatt, R.S. *Officer grade requirements project: IV. Development and validation of a policy equation to predict criterion board ratings.* PRL-TR-66-16, AD-656 125. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Research Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Division, November 1966.

Hoggatt, R.S., & Christal, R.E. *Officer grade requirements project III. Analysis of criterion board rating behavior.* PRL-TR-66-15, AD-676 647. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Research Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Division, September 1966.

Lindquist, E.F. *Design and analysis of experiments.* New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1953.

Madden, J.M. *Context effects in job evaluation.* WADD-TN-60-220, AD-249 950. Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Research Laboratory, Wright Air Development Division, October 1960.

APPENDIX A: BENCHMARK FACTOR SCALES

FACTOR 1: FORMAL EDUCATION: The amount of formal education required by the job. Consider the education obtained in high school, college, university, or professional school.

LEVEL 9

Staff Legal Officer, Military Affairs, Hq USAF
Computer Systems Design Engineer-Mathematician, Hq Major Air Command
Chief, Ballistic Program, Aerospace Test Wg

LEVEL 8

Physicist, General, Air Force Special Weapons Center
Bioenvironmental Engineer, Environmental Health Laboratory
Assistant Program Manager, C-5, Hq Major Air Command

LEVEL 7

Deputy Commander for Maintenance, Strategic Missile Wg
Electronic Systems Installation Officer, Electronics Installation Sq
Chief, Munitions Div, Hq Numbered Air Force

LEVEL 6

Chief Data Systems & Statistics, Combat Support Gp
Deputy Commander, Combat Support Gp
Asst Staff Electronics Officer, Combat Evaluation Gp

LEVEL 5

Assistant DCS/Personnel, Hq Air Weather Service
Aerial Reconnaissance Weather Officer, Weather Reconnaissance Sq
Armament Staff Officer, Inspector General Gp

LEVEL 4

OIC Armament & Electronics Branch, Consolidated Aircraft Maintenance Sq
Chief, Personnel Div, Hq Combat Support Gp
Electronic Warfare Officer, Strategic Reconnaissance Sq

LEVEL 3

Chief, Photographic Services Branch, Aerospace Reconnaissance Technical Wg
Chief Munitions Maintenance Branch, Munition Maintenance Sq
Organizational Maint Officer, Interceptor Fighter Sq

LEVEL 2

Chief Transportation Traffic Management, Transportation Sq
Group Supply Officer, Aeromedical Evacuation Gp
Base Fuels Officer, Fighter Wg

LEVEL 1

Vehicle Maintenance Officer, Transportation Sq
Food Service Officer, Combat Support Gp
Clothing Sales Officer, Combat Support Gp

FACTOR 2: SPECIAL TRAINING AND WORK EXPERIENCE: The extent to which the job requires knowledges and skills which must be acquired through special training courses or on-the-job experience. Disregard general courses given by Squadron Officer School, Command and Staff College, or War College.

LEVEL 9

Chief, Contract Pricing Branch, Hq USAF
Chief, Military Justice Division, Air Div
Space Vehicle Research Officer, Hq AF Special Weapons Center

LEVEL 8

Director, Reconnaissance & Electronic Warfare Operations, Major Air Command
Minuteman Trajectory Engineer, Aerospace Reconnaissance Technical Wg
Chief, Missile/Nuclear Safety Division, Technical Training Center

LEVEL 7

Missile Combat Crew Commander, Strategic Missile Sq
Chief, Target Intelligence Branch, Strategic Reconnaissance Wg
Chief, Maintenance Operations Div, Aerospace Test Gp

LEVEL 6

Chief, Consolidated Base Personnel Office, Bomb Wg
Flying Safety Officer, Hq Tactical Fighter Wg
Reconnaissance Aircraft Commander, Strategic Reconnaissance Sq

LEVEL 5

Co-pilot B-52, Bomb Sq
Pilot, Military Airlift Sq
Radar Evaluation Officer, Hq Major Air Command (Overseas)

LEVEL 4

Chief, Audio-Visual Center, Numbered Air Force
Electronic Warfare Officer B-52, Bomb Sq
Education-Training Officer, Major Air Command

LEVEL 3

Crypto Operations Officer, Communications Gp (Overseas)
Avionics Officer, Consolidated Aircraft Maintenance Sq
Flight Line Maintenance Officer, Organizational Maintenance Sq

LEVEL 2

Photographic Equipment Maintenance Officer, Avionics Maintenance Sq
Chief, Pay & Travel Branch, Combat Support Gp
Photographic Officer, Technical Reconnaissance Sq

LEVEL 1

Base Housing Officer, Combat Support Gp
Special Service Officer, Fighter Gp
Transportation Officer, Instrumentation Sq

FACTOR 3: WORKING CONDITIONS: The extent to which the job involves uncomfortable working conditions. Consider such conditions as isolation, irregular hours, monotony, prolonged vigilance, extensive TDY, and pressure to meet deadlines.

LEVEL 9

Forward Air Controller, Tactical Air Support Sq (Overseas)
Co-pilot KC-135, Air Refueling Sq
Commander, B-52, Bomb Wg

LEVEL 8

Pilot, Reconnaissance, Tactical Reconnaissance Sq (Overseas)
Tactical Fighter Pilot, Tactical Fighter Sq
Instructor Pilot, FB-111, Bomb Sq

LEVEL 7

Pilot, Search and Rescue, Aerospace Rescue & Recovery Sq
Weapons Controller, Aircraft Control & Warning Sq
Instructor Navigator, Transport, Military Airlift Sq

LEVEL 6

Electrical Engineer, Site Alteration Task Force
Director of Intelligence, Numbered Air Force (Overseas)
Communications Security Officer, Mobile Communications Gp

LEVEL 5

Weather Forecaster, Weather Det
Chief, Logistics Division, Military Airlift Wg
Nurse Anesthetist, Medical Center

LEVEL 4

Transportation Officer, Transportation Sq
Director of Manpower and Organization, Air Division
Chief Airman Personnel Division, Hq Major Air Command

LEVEL 3

Asst Staff Judge Advocate, Combat Support Gp
Clinical Psychologist, Medical Center
Chief Military Justice Division, AF Missile Test Center

LEVEL 2

Special Services Officer, Air Base Gp
Pharmacy Officer, USAF Hospital
Staff Chaplain, Numbered Air Force

LEVEL 1

Officers' Open Mess Custodian, Air Base Gp
Custodian, Non Appropriated Funds, Air Base Gp
Information Officer, Bomb Wg

FACTOR 4: ORIGINALITY, INGENUITY, AND CREATIVENESS: The extent to which the job requires new and unique methods, approaches, and solutions to problems. Consider the demand for novel ideas and inventiveness.

LEVEL 9

Research Aviation Physiologist, USAF School of Aviation Medicine
Astronautical Engineer, Propulsion, Rocket Propulsion Lab
Human Performance Engineer, Electronic Systems Div

LEVEL 8

Logistic Staff Officer, Hq Air Materiel Area
Manpower Management Staff Officer, Hq Major Air Command
Director, Department of Aircraft Maintenance Training, Tech School

LEVEL 7

Missile Safety Officer, Air Force Eastern Test Range
Base Deputy Commander for Materiel, Combat Support Gp
Management Engineering Officer, Hq Air Materiel Area

LEVEL 6

Civil Engineer, Civil Engineer Sq
Chief Re-Entry Vehicle Maintenance Branch, Missile Maintenance Sq
Flying Safety Officer, Tactical Fighter Wg

LEVEL 5

Missile Combat Crew Commander, Strategic Missile Sq
Reconnaissance Pilot, Tactical Reconnaissance Sq
Commander, Weather Sq

LEVEL 4

Precision Photographic Services Officer, Strategic Reconnaissance Wg
Chief Transportation Traffic Management, Transportation Sq
Computer Maintenance Officer, Hq Major Air Command

LEVEL 3

Launch Area Maintenance Officer, Air Defense Missile Sq
Academic Instructor-Undergraduate Pilot Training, Student Sq
Clinical Laboratory Officer, USAF Hospital

LEVEL 2

Asst Base Equipment Management Officer, Supply Sq
Co-Pilot B-52, Bomb Sq
Accounting & Finance Officer, Combat Support Gp

LEVEL 1

Asst Medical Supply Officer, Medical Center
Optometry Officer, USAF Hospital
Chief, Administrative Services, Air Base Gp

FACTOR 5: COMMUNICATION SKILLS: The extent to which the job requires skill in oral and written communication. Consider the complexity and variety of information communicated as well as the level of the individuals and agencies involved.

LEVEL 9

Director of Information, Hq Major Air Command
Political Military Affairs Officer, Hq USAF
Secretary of the Air Staff, Hq USAF

LEVEL 8

Chief of Logistics Division, Hq Numbered Air Force
Astronautical Engineer, Hq Space & Missile Systems Org
OSI District Commander, Hq District OSI

LEVEL 7

Base Civil Engineer, Air Base Gp
Human Performance Engineer, Electronic Systems Div
Comptroller, Air Base Wg

LEVEL 6

Aviation Physiologist, Inspector General Gp
Chemical Engineer, AF Aero Propulsion Lab
Administrative Officer, Electronics Installation Gp

LEVEL 5

Officer Selection Officer, Det, USAF Recruiting Gp
Deputy Commander, Strategic Missile Sq
Chief, Sensors Section, AF Special Weapons Center

LEVEL 4

Construction Engineer, Civil Engineering Sq (Overseas)
Squadron Operations Officer, Combat Crew Training Sq
Accounting & Finance Officer, Fighter Gp

LEVEL 3

Commercial Transportation Officer, Materiel Sq
Avionics Officer, Aircraft Control & Warning Wg
Missile Maintenance Control Officer, Strategic Missile Sq

LEVEL 2

Fighter Interceptor Pilot, Fighter Intercetor Sq
Strategic Missile Complex Maintenance Officer, Strategic Missile Sq
Electronic Warfare Officer, Tactical Reconnaissance Sq

LEVEL 1

Co-pilot, Air Refueling Sq
Navigator, Bomb Sq
Helicopter Pilot, Aerospace Rescue & Recovery Sq

FACTOR 6: INTERPERSONAL SKILLS: The extent to which the job requires skill in dealing with people. Consider the need for sensitiveness, responsiveness, persuasiveness, self-control, and tact, as well as the possible consequences when such skills are not employed.

LEVEL 9

Staff Chaplain, Numbered Air Force
Political Military Affairs Officer, Hq USAF
Commander, Air Refueling Wg

LEVEL 8

Asst Professor of Economics, USAFA
Academic Instructor, Dept of Chemistry & Physiology, USAFA
Security Staff Officer, Hq Major Air Command

LEVEL 7

Commissary Officer, Air Base Gp
Wing Director of Safety, Bomb Wg
OSI Detachment Commander, OSI Det

LEVEL 6

Base Procurement Officer, Flying Training Wg
Instructor Navigator Bombardier, Flying Training Wg
Comptroller, Air Materiel Area

LEVEL 5

Communications-Electronics Staff Officer, Hq Major Air Command
Base Supply Officer, Combat Support Gp
Chief Accounting and Finance Division, Combat Support Gp

LEVEL 4

Special Services Officer, Services Sq
Chief, Medical Materiel Services, Medical Center
Maintenance Supervisor, Avionics Maintenance Sq

LEVEL 3

Air Freight Supervisor, Aerial Port Sq
Airborne Electronics Maintenance Officer, Fighter Interceptor Sq
Construction Engineer, Civil Engineering Sq (Overseas)

LEVEL 2

OIC Photo Laboratory, Reconnaissance Tech Sq
Avionics Officer, Avionics Maintenance Sq
Precision Photographic Services Officer, Strategic Reconnaissance Wg

LEVEL 1

OIC Weapons Services Branch, Munition Maintenance Sq
Navigator, Air Refueling Sq
Co-pilot, Air Refueling Sq

FACTOR 7: JUDGMENT AND DECISION MAKING: The importance and independence of judgments and decisions required by the job. Consider the nature, variety, and possible impact of decisions. The less well defined the guidance for decisions, the higher should be the rating; while the more specific and detailed the guidance, the lower should be the rating.

LEVEL 9

Chief, Budget Div, Hq Major Air Command
Staff Legal Officer, Military Affairs, Hq USAF
Chief, Weapon System Testing Div, Space & Missile Systems Org

LEVEL 8

Deputy Commander, Combat Support Gp
Missile Maintenance Inspector, IG, Hq Major Air Command
DCS/Comptroller, Hq Numbered Air Force (Overseas)

LEVEL 7

Logistics Officer, Space & Missile Systems Org
Experimental Flight Test Officer, Hq Aeronautical Systems Division
Chief of Personnel, Combat Support Gp

LEVEL 6

Commander, Organizational Maintenance Sq
Missile Safety Officer, Strategic Missile Wg
Missile Combat Crew Commander (ICBM), Strategic Missile Sq

LEVEL 5

Maintenance Officer, Strategic Missile Wg
Base Operations Officer, Combat Support Gp
Aircraft Commander KC-135, Air Refueling Sq

LEVEL 4

Munitions Maintenance Supervisor, Munitions Maintenance Sq
OIC, Maintenance Analysis Branch, Communications Area
Fighter Interceptor Pilot, Fighter Interceptor Sq

LEVEL 3

Reconnaissance Pilot, Tactical Reconnaissance Sq
Pilot, Transport, Military Airlift Sq
Special Services Officer, Services Sq

LEVEL 2

Traffic Management Officer, Transportation Sq
Fuels Officer, Air Base Gp
Helicopter Pilot, Combat Support Gp

LEVEL 1

Recreation Services Officer, Combat Support Gp
Pharmacy Officer, USAF Dispensary
Photographic Officer, Reconnaissance Technical Wg

FACTOR 8: PLANNING: The extent to which planning is required by the job. Consider the scope and significance of work for which planning is done. The longer the time span for which planning is done, the higher the rating should be.

LEVEL 9

Deputy Chief, Plans Division, Hq Major Air Command
Asst Director of War Plans, Hq Major Air Command
Director, Joint Operations Task Force, NORAD

LEVEL 8

Chief, R & D Contracts Div, Air Force Special Weapons Center
Management Engineering Officer, Air Materiel Area
Wing Logistics Officer, Air Refueling Wg

LEVEL 7

Maintenance Control Officer, Bomb Wg
Deputy Commander, Combat Support Gp
Budget Officer, Air Base Gp

LEVEL 6

Operations Officer, Fighter Interceptor Sq
Hospital Administrator, USAF Hospital
Chief, Data Services Division, Combat Support Gp

LEVEL 5

Chief, Career Control Branch, Air Base Gp
Traffic Management Officer, Transportation Sq
Procurement Officer, Combat Support Gp

LEVEL 4

Missile Combat Crew Commander, Strategic Missile Sq
Wing Administration Officer, Military Airlift Wg
Weapons Officer, Tactical Fighter Wg

LEVEL 3

Electronic Warfare Officer, Bomb Sq
Medical Administrative Officer, USAF Dispensary
Reconnaissance Pilot, Tactical Recon Sq

LEVEL 2

Fighter Interceptor Pilot, Fighter Interceptor Sq
Registrar, Medical Center
Security Police Officer, Security Police Sq

LEVEL 1

Flight Nurse, Aeromedical Evacuation Sq (Overseas)
Weather Forecaster, Weather Det
Optometrist, Medical Center

FACTOR 9: MANAGEMENT: The level of executive, and managerial skills required in the job. Consider the complexity, variety, and level of the activities which are directed, organized, coordinated, controlled, commanded, or evaluated.

LEVEL 9

Director of Budget, Hq Major Air Command
Commander, Combat Support Gp (Overseas)
Wing Commander, Tactical Control Wg (Overseas)

LEVEL 8

Wing Commander, Aerospace Rescue & Recovery Wg
Chief of Operations, Strategic Missile Sq
Deputy Commander, Air Base Gp

LEVEL 7

Maintenance Supervisor, Avionics Maintenance Sq
Squadron Operations Officer, Combat Crew Training Sq
Base Accounting & Finance Officer, Flying Training Wg

LEVEL 6

Chief, Consolidated Base Personnel Office, Combat Support Gp
Base Procurement Officer, Pilot Training Wg
Helicopter Squadron Operations Officer, Flying Training Sq

LEVEL 5

Traffic Management Officer, Transportation Sq
Base Communications Maintenance Officer, Communications Sq (Overseas)
Missile Combat Crew Commander, Strategic Missile Sq

LEVEL 4

Chief, Utilities Operations Division, Civil Engineering Sq
Chief, Photo Evaluation Branch, Photographic Sq
Base Fuels Officer, Supply Sq

LEVEL 3

Primary Pilot Training Instructor, Pilot Training Sq
Space Surveillance Officer, Aerospace Support Sq
Air Traffic Controller, Communication Sq

LEVEL 2

Administrative Officer, Air Base Sq
Data Services Officer, Combat Support Gp
Tactical Fighter Pilot, Tactical Fighter Sq

LEVEL 1

Clinical Psychologist, USAF Hospital
Psychiatric Social Worker, USAF Hospital
Helicopter Pilot Single Rotor, Air Base Sq

FACTOR 10: RISK: The extent to which the job requires exposure to risk of death or severe injury in peace-time.

LEVEL 9

Forward Air Controller, Tactical Air Support Sq (Overseas)
Tactical Fighter Pilot, Tactical Fighter Sq
Instructor Pilot, Tactical Fighter, Combat Crew Training Sq

LEVEL 8

Pilot, EB-66, Tactical Electronic Warfare Sq (Overseas)
Navigator, Troop Carrier, Military Airlift Sq
Helicopter Pilot, Aerospace Rescue & Recovery Sq

LEVEL 7

Instructor Missile Launch Officer, Strategic Missile Sq
Arctic Survival Training Officer, Strategic Wg (Overseas)
Chief, Propellants Programming Br, AF Rocket Propulsion Laboratory

LEVEL 6

Commander, Radar Sq
Research Biochemist, School of Aerospace Medicine
Chemist, Air Force Materials Laboratory

LEVEL 5

Chief, General Investigations Div, Hq District OSI
Base Veterinarian, USAF Hospital
Commander, Civil Engineering Sq

LEVEL 4

Mechanical Engineer, Space & Missile Test Center
Air Traffic Control Officer, Communications Sq
Instructor, Institute for Professional Development

LEVEL 3

Medical Supply Officer, USAF Hospital
Chief, Engineering Standards Branch, Communications Region
Chief Machine Processing, Air Base Gp

LEVEL 2

Recreation Services Officer, Combat Support Gp
Chaplain, Combat Support Gp
Manpower Management Staff Officer, Flying Training Wg

LEVEL 1

Custodian Non Appropriated Funds, Air Base Wg
Clothing Sales Store Officer, Air Base Wg
Instructor, French, Dept of Foreign Languages, USAFA

APPENDIX B: PROJECT OFFICER INSTRUCTIONS

Each MET project officer is responsible for accomplishing the steps specified in Phases I and II below. Review all materials in your package before proceeding.

PHASE I

Step 1. According to available records, the officers listed in attachment 2 are assigned to your base. Each officer with a red check by his name will be requested to complete a job description survey form (see attachment 3). Contact each officer with a red check by his name and, if he is available, forward to him one of the brown envelopes containing a job description survey form and letter of instructions. A substitute to complete the job description must be obtained for each officer who is not available. Substitutes should be selected in the following order of priority:

a. The officer's replacement, if on base at least six weeks.

b. Another officer in the same grade and DAFSC (see attachment 2).

c. Another officer in the same grade, and related DAFSC.

d. Another officer in an adjacent grade but in the same DAFSC.

Step 2. The officer job description surveys are to be completed and returned to you within 15 working days after their receipt by each individual officer selected. Contact each officer at the end of the first week to insure they received the job description survey and are making progress toward its completion.

Step 3. Upon return of all the completed job description surveys fold each description so that pages 2 and 3 of the job description are on the outside. Take out the job descriptions that are already in the job description folder (attachment 4) and randomly mix these job descriptions together with the new job descriptions you have obtained. Fasten all of the job descriptions back into the folder, making sure that each job description is folded back so that only pages 2 and 3 may be read.

PHASE II

This phase requires *you* and *all* available manpower and management engineering personnel at your location to rate each job description in the folder in accordance with the Rater Instructions (attachment 5). Administrative and clerical personnel will not be used as raters. If more than twelve qualified raters are available, obtain ratings only from the most experienced twelve. After the raters have been identified, accomplish the following steps:

First; in accordance with information on the *Rater Instructions* (attachment 5), you will rate the *Officer Job Descriptions* (attachment 4) and fill in the required information on the *Rating Form* (attachment 6). Make sure that the job numbers are filled in correctly and that there is a factor and grade code rating entered in each block.

Second; have each of the other raters complete a Rating Form and *independently* accomplish the job ratings. In each instance, you will review the Rating Form for completeness.

Third; when all ratings have been completed, inclose all study materials in the pre-addressed envelope (attachment 7) and forward the package to the Occupational Research Division, AFHRL, Lackland AFB TX 78236.

*The Project Officer instructions were contained in a letter to all MET commanders and included 7 attachments.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Project Officer instructions
2. Roster of job incumbents
3. Job description survey
4. Job description folder
5. Rater instructions
6. Rating Forms
7. Return envelope

APPENDIX C: **AIR FORCE OFFICER JOB SURVEY**

AIR FORCE OFFICER JOB SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS

This survey is directed by Hq USAF to identify and describe the work performed by officers in the Air Force. The Air Force needs precise information about the duties, tasks, and requirements of officer jobs in order to maintain the classification structure, to make appropriate grade allocations, to define incumbent qualifications, and to guide other manpower and personnel actions. Participation in this survey gives you an opportunity to provide accurate information about your job in support of improved Air Force management.

You are requested to complete the survey according to the following instructions:

1. ASSIGNMENT INFORMATION (Page 4): Fill in the required data or check the one box in each block that applies to you.

2. JOB DESCRIPTION (Pages 2 and 3): On these pages provide typewritten* information which accurately and comprehensively describes your job.

   a. In the JOB NAME OR TITLE block, record a name or title which is descriptive of your job.

   b. In the JOB CONTEXT block, locate your job within the organizational structure.

      Examples: (1) THIS JOB IS IN THE HEAVY EQUIPMENT BRANCH DIRECTLY UNDER THE BASE MOTOR POOL COMMANDER, WHO REPORTS TO THE M & S GROUP COMMANDER.

      (2) THIS JOB IS IN THE TARGETS SECTION OF THE OPERATIONS PLANNING BRANCH OF WING HQ.

   c. In the blocks under DUTIES AND TASKS, list statements that describe your job. Consider significant work activities such as those involved in commanding, planning, organizing, directing, monitoring, coordinating, reviewing, inspecting, evaluating, supervising, and operating. Use as many blocks as you consider necessary. The statements you provide should clearly define your job.

      Example: Duty A. DIRECTING MATERIEL CONTROL FUNCTIONS

      TASKS (1) ASSIGN PRIORITIES TO REQUISITIONS

      (2) COORDINATE REQUIREMENTS FOR MOBILITY DEPLOYMENT

      (3) MONITOR SUPPLY BUDGET

      (4) PROCESS REQUESTS FOR LOCAL MANUFACTURE OF ITEMS

      (5) REQUISITION TIME CHANGE ITEMS

      First, list all the major duties you perform, then go back and list the appropriate tasks under each duty. Describe your normal job. Omit temporary variations in your work which are not part of your regular assignment. Ignore additional duties unless they constitute a significant part of your job.

   d. In the JOB REQUIREMENTS block, enter additional statements that describe any unusual requirements of your job for the factors below.

      COMMUNICATION SKILLS
      INTERPERSONAL SKILLS
      WORKING CONDITIONS
      FORMAL EDUCATION
      ORIGINALITY, INGENUITY, & CREATIVENESS
      SPECIAL TRAINING & WORK EXPERIENCE
      JUDGMENT & DECISION MAKING
      MANAGEMENT
      PLANNING
      RISK

      Examples: (1) WORKING CONDITIONS: JOB REQUIRES APPROXIMATELY 120 DAYS TDY ANNUALLY.

      (2) SPECIAL TRAINING & WORK EXPERIENCE: JOB REQUIRES A 30-DAY AF COURSE IN SPECIAL WEAPONS DELIVERY.

   e. In the JOB SUMMARY Block, write a three-or four-sentence summary description of your job.

   f. After you have completed pages 2, 3, and 4, sign in the space provided on page 4 and submit this form to your supervisor.

NOTE: Supervisor will review all entries, check a box to indicate his judgment of the most appropriate grade level for this job, and sign the form.

29

*If typing service is not available, information should be clearly printed by hand.

JOB DESCRIPTION
JOB NAME OR TITLE
JOB CONTEXT
DUTIES AND TASKS
DUTY A: Tasks
DUTY B: Tasks
DUTY C: Tasks
DUTY D: Tasks

30

DUTY E:

Tasks

DUTY F:

Tasks

DUTY G:

Tasks

DUTY H:

Tasks

JOB REQUIREMENTS

JOB SU

ASSIGNMENT INFORMATION

LAST NAME | **FIRST NAME** | **M.I.**

ORGANIZATION (5-40)

BASE OR INSTALLATION (41-80)

SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT NUMBER

Number (2:5-13) | Suffix (14-15)

YOUR PRIMARY AFSC

Prefix (16) | Number (17-20) | Suffix (21)

MAJOR AIR COMMAND (38)

- AAC A
- USAFA B
- ADC C
- USAFE D
- AFAFC E
- AFLC F
- APSC H
- ARPC I
- ATC J
- AU K
- USAFSO L
- AFRES M
- Hq USAF N
- AFDAA O
- Hq Comd P
- MAC Q
- PACAF R
- SAC S
- TAC T
- USAFSS U
- AFCS Y
- Other Z

Specify

UMD AUTHORIZED GRADE FOR YOUR POSITION (22)

- Overage A
- W/O B
- Lt 2
- Capt 3
- Maj 4
- L/C 5
- Col 6

YOUR PRESENT GRADE (23)

- W/O 8
- 2/Lt 1
- 1/Lt 2
- Capt 3
- Maj 4
- L/C 5
- Col 6

GRADE OF YOUR IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR (24)

- Civ B
- 2/Lt 1
- 1/Lt 2
- Capt 3
- Maj 4
- L/C 5
- Col 6
- Gen 7

YOUR DUTY AFSC

Prefix (25) | Number (26-29) | Suffix (30)

TOTAL MONTHS IN YOUR DUTY AFSC (31-33)

TOTAL MONTHS ACTIVE FEDERAL MILITARY SERVICE (34-36)

SEX (check one) (37)

M 1 | F 2

LEVEL OF YOUR ORGANIZATION (39)

- DOD, Hq USAF 9
- Hq Maj Air Comd 8
- Numbered AF (or Equiv) 7
- Air Division (or Equiv) 6
- Wing (or Equiv) 5
- Group (or Equiv) 4
- Squadron (or Equiv) 3
- Detachment (or Equiv) 2
- Other (Specify) 1

LEVEL OF YOUR JOB WITHIN YOUR ORGANIZATION (40)

- Command Element 7
- Directorate, Dept, Office (or Equiv) 6
- Division (or Equiv) 5
- Branch (or Equiv) 4
- Section (or Equiv) 3
- Unit (or Equiv) 2
- Other (Specify) 1

HIGHEST LEVEL OF YOUR EDUCATION (41)

- Non High School Grad 1
- High School Grad 2
- 1 Year College 3
- 2 Years College 4
- 3 Years College 5
- Bachelor's Degree 6
- Some Post-Grad Work 7
- Master's Degree 8
- Doctoral Degree 9

YOUR MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY (42)

- Education 1
- Physical Science 2
- Arts, Humanities 3
- Engineering 4
- Business, Management 5
- Medical, Legal 6
- Social Science 7
- Military Science 8
- Other (Specify) 9

SUPERVISOR'S JUDGMENT OF MOST APPROPRIATE GRADE FOR THIS JOB (43)

- Lt 2
- Capt 3
- Maj 4
- L/C 5
- Col 6
- Gen 7

COMPLETED BY:

Signature | Duty Phone | Date

REVIEWED BY: *SUPERVISOR CHECK ONE →*

Signature of Immediate Supervisor | DAFSC | Date

APPENDIX D: MET RATER INSTRUCTIONS

This research study is designed to develop and test a methodology by which management engineering and manpower personnel can apply job evaluation factors to more objectively determine officer grades based on job content and responsibilities. The success of this study depends on your cooperation in explicitly following these instructions.

The officer in charge of manpower and management engineering activities at your base is the project officer for this study and will answer any questions you may have about the project. *Your* task is to (a) rate a number of officer jobs on 10 job evaluation factors and (b) to estimate the grade required to perform the job according to the grade code scale provided. Your independent judgments on the evaluation factors and the proper grade code for each job are required. For this reason you are *not* to confer with any other raters about the ratings.

1. Complete all of page 1 of your Rating Form except for the remarks section. If you have any remarks, write them in after completing all ratings. Print all information neatly and legibly in the appropriate spaces provided.

2. Review all of the factors on pages 1 through 10 following these directions. Notice that each factor has 9 levels which are defined by representative job titles. Your task is to read each job description in the job description folder and rate them on each of the 10 factors. For example, after reading the first job description, you will rate that job description from 1 to 9 on Factor 1, Formal Education. If you feel the job description requires about the same level of education as the job titles listed at level 4 of the formal education factor, you will place the number 4 on the Rating Form under Factor 1. Then, rate that job on all the other factors (2 through 10) following the same procedure. In each instance, study the factor definition and job levels before making your rating.

3. Next, you will turn to the last page following these directions (page 11) and decide what officer grade should be authorized for the job described. Do this by writing the proper number from the Grade Code Listing (1 to 16) into the Grade Code box on your rating form for the job number you are rating. Notice in the Grade Code Listing that there are three numbers associated with each grade level except General. The three numbers in a set are used to show three levels of experience. For instance, a 4 represents a captain with a short time in grade, a 5 represents a captain with an average time in grade, and a 6 represents a captain with a long time in grade.

4. Now take the job description folder. Notice at the top of each description there is a number. Write this number in the first block under the column labeled JOB NUMBER on page 2 of your rating form.

5. Now read the first job description and rate it on all 10 factors and the grade code. Then rate the second job description and continue until all job descriptions have been rated. Be sure to place the job number for each description in the appropriate JOB NUMBER block on your rating form before rating that job description. If any of the job descriptions you are rating appear to include outdated equipment or organizational level, proceed as if the descriptions were current.

When you have finished rating each of the jobs, return all materials to your project officer.

APPENDIX E: GRADE CODE SCALE

G R A D E C O D E S C A L E

GRADE	CODE
LIEUTENANT	1 2 3
CAPTAIN	4 5 6
MAJOR	7 8 9
LIEUTENANT COLONEL	10 11 12
COLONEL	13 14 15
GENERAL	16

APPENDIX F: **MET RATING FORM**

RATING FORM

(1-3 4)

LAST NAME | FIRST NAME | MI

ORGANIZATION AND BASE

SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT

PREFIX (7-8) | NUMBER (9-17) | SUFFIX (18-19)

CHECK YOUR CLASSIFICATION/STATUS

☐ ENLISTED E1-E9 ☐ OFFICER O1-O8 ☐ CIVILIAN GS (20)

YOUR AIR FORCE DUTY AFSC

PREFIX (21) | NUMBER (22-26)

YOUR PRESENT GRADE

(27-28)

TOTAL MONTHS IN PRESENT DAFSC

(29-31)

TOTAL MONTHS AT PRESENT MET

(32-34)

TOTAL MONTHS OF FEDERAL SERVICE

(35-37)

TOTAL MONTHS EXPERIENCE IN MANAGEMENT ENGINEERING/MANPOWER

(38-40)

MAJOR COMMAND (41)

A ☐ AAC	P ☐ HQ COMD	C ☐ ADC	E ☐ AFAFC	V ☐ AFCS	F ☐ AFLC	M ☐ AFRES	I ☐ ARPC
H ☐ AFSC	J ☐ ATC	K ☐ AU	N ☐ HQ USAF	Q ☐ MAC	R ☐ PACAF	Z ☐ OTHER	☐
S ☐ SAC	T ☐ TAC	B ☐ USAFA	D ☐ USAFE	L ☐ USAFSO	U ☐ USAFSS	O ☐ AFDAA	☐

HAVE YOU COMPLETED EITHER THF ME or AMETA WORK METHODS AND STANDARDS TRAINING COURSE?

☐ YES 1 ☐ NO 2 (42)

MAJORITY OF AIR FORCE CAREER EXPERIENCE SPENT IN: *(CHECK ONE)*

1 ☐ MANAGEMENT ENGINEERING

2 ☐ MANPOWER (43)

3 ☐ BOTH MANAGEMENT ENGINEERING AND MANPOWER

4 ☐ OTHER _____ (SPECIFY) (44-70)

REMARKS SECTION

37

JOB NUMBER	JOB FACTORS										GRADE CODE
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

APPENDIX G: UMD/UDL Authorized Grades on Jobs Collected in Each Job Sample

Career Field	Lt		Capt		Maj		Lt Col		Col	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
00			1	1		1	18	14	53	11
02					1					2
05			1		2					
09			1							
10			1		1					
11					2		2			
12					1		2			
13			3		1		1			
14		3	42	13	54	15	31	4	7	
15			1				1			
16	1	2	7	1	3	2				
17	1		22		4		1			
18	11	5	24	8	24	5	11	3	5	2
19						1		1		
20			8		1		1		1	
22			29		31		12		1	
23			2	1	1		2	1	1	
25	3	1	16	7	4	4	6	3	1	1
26	5	6	8	10	10	7	3	3		
27							6	1	5	5
28	14	11	50	8	27	6	25	3	4	2
29			1	2	6		4		3	
30	1	7	29	4	34	7	10	2	4	1
31	2	4	7	7	4	2	4	1	2	
35					1					
40	3	1	30	5	28	5	34	3	9	2
43							1			
46		1	11	1	7	2	5			
51	3	1	24	1	15	1	8			
55	9	4	22	8	13	3	10	1	5	4
57		3		4		1		3		
60	1	2	11	2	13	5	3	1	1	1
62		2	8	3	4	1	2			
63	2	1	2	2	1	1				1
64	5	1	16	2	11	2	16	3	4	2
65	7		16		5	1	6		4	
66			8		5	1	8		2	
67	1	3	10	5	8	7	4	3		3
69			3		3					
70	11	3	45	1	8	6	11	2	1	1
73	3	1	33	5	22	4	18	4		2
74	1	3	5	2	2	5	2	1		1
75		2	5	3	7	2	5	3	2	1
79			6	3	4	1	1	1		3
80	2	2	24	7	8	6	4	4		
81	3	2	9		6	1	2			
87	1									
88		1	11	2	7	4	10	3	1	1
89		1	20	2	5	4	3	1	2	1
90	3	2	11	3	3	3	6	5	1	
91	2	6	8	7	3	2		1		1
92	3	4	7	4	1	5				
97	41	7	42	4	11	2	5	1	1	
99			4	1	4	1		4		
Unknown AFSC	3		13		4		3			
Totals	142	92	657	139	420	126	307	80	121	48

Note. – A = 1,687 Job Sample including 12 missing data and 28 overages. B = 485 Job Sample.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1976-671-613/24